Individual Evaluation Form

Proposal Number: 07-CCSP_07-0001

Orgnization Name: LMD/IPSL

Principal Investigator: Emily Chien

Evaluation Summary

Solicitation Title:	Earth Science Document Review
Solicitation Number:	NNH07ZDA001R
Evaluation Status:	Submitted (07/30/2007 @ 11:26:29 EDT by Robert Venezia)
Review:	CCSP - PUBLIC HEALTH CHAPTER ONLY [CCSP PUB HEALTH]
Reviewer:	Robert Venezia (Reviewer)

Overall Grade:

Evaluation Criteria

Question 1 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

General Comments: This section mentions some extremely important concepts that must be understood for Earth science outcomes and remote sensing technology to be successful in public health decision-making. The use of DDSPL as an example tool works well for pointing out the challenges that the public health practice community faces that ultimately will determine whether or when Earth science outcomes will have a place in public health practice. Unfortunately, the concepts are only briefly described and not covered in much depth. Strengths: The author is a recognized expert in the Earth science and public health communities. His contributions to the use of GIS in public health science and practice are well known and have been invaluable. Among some of the strong discussion points, the sentence at lines 1890-1 about stopping short of characterizing risk in human populations represents an important issue for maintaining credibility with the public health community. Kudos for including it! Too often, Earth science outcomes and remote sensing technology capabilities are misconstrued by non-technical people as a result of being oversold or sloppily described by the Earth science community. More on this would be helpful and welcomed. The notion that the application of science and technology depends upon healthcare policy decisions is incredibly important for the Earth science community to understand. Success of the application is only partly dependent upon performance of the technology and of the validity of the science results. Even if we could image a tick from space, it may not yield more success in fighting Lyme Disease than an inexpensive vaccine. These decisions belong to public health policy makers. Weaknesses: The statement in line 1807 that begins "Public health is an approach to medicine..." represents a minority view in the public health community that is somewhat offensive to practitioners who consider public health a freestanding discipline and profession. This is an old debate, but one that NASA ought to avoid if it wishes to avoid a catfight with sensitive members of the public health practice community...such as this reviewer. Use a better definition of public health to lead off this section. See the American Public Health Association for an "official" version. Discussion of the complex relationship between climate change and public health outcomes is short and never really generalizes--or draws lessons learned--from the experience of the DDSPL tool in identifying the distribution of the Black Legged Tick for use in forecasting Lyme Disease. This should be the major point of the chapter. What challenges can the Earth science community expect in transitioning Earth science outcomes to use in public health practice, and what can the public health community expect technologically and scientifically from the investment in climate change science and technology? Grammatical / Style Line 1819: The phrase "key constraint" sounds odd. Not sure how public health is a problem solving constraint in climate change situations. Protecting public health makes sense as a "key goal" for addressing climate change and may become a "key challenge" under certain climate change scenarios. Lines 1813, 1817, 1818: Use of the phrase "as such" sounds a bit clumsy. Lines 1815: This should read "a few applications" rather than "few applications." Alternatively, the word "insurmountable" should be changed to "insignificant."

Question 2 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 3 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 4 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 5 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 6 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 7 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).

Question 8 : Please distinguish issues you consider to be of general/major concern(s) from other, less significant point(s).